



12/27/04

IPW 1637/SA

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Patent No.: 066661-0025

PATENT

### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Krassen Dimitrov

Customer No.: 41552

Appl. No. : 09/898,743

Confirmation No.: 3666

Filed : July 03, 2001

Title : METHODS FOR DETECTION AND  
QUANTIFICATION OF ANALYTES  
IN COMPLEX MIXTURES

Grp./A.U. : 1637

Examiner: : CHUNDURU, S.

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL(37 CFR § 1.10)

"Express Mail" Mailing Label Number EV 602 200 814 US

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR § 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on Dec 23, 2004.

Carrie Casey

### AMENDMENT

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

#### Introductory Comments:

In response to the Office Action dated August 23, 2004, please consider the above-identified application as follows. This response is being submitted on or before the extended due date of December 23, 2004.

Please amend the above-identified application as follows:

**Interview Summary** begins on page 2 of this paper.

**Amendments to the Claims** are reflected in the listing of claims that begins on page 3 of this paper.

**Remarks/Arguments** begin on page 14 of this paper.

**Interview Summary:**

Applicant thanks the Examiners for the courtesy extended to Applicant in granting the interview on November 10, 2004 regarding the general nature of the invention and the rejections made in the first office action. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 was discussed in regards to the cited prior art. The Examiners also suggested that Barany et al. patents on zip code technology might be applicable to the proposed amended claims. In addition, the Examiners objected to the term “about” in the instant claims.

The Examiners suggested further claim amendments to insert a genedigit limitation. The Examiner indicated that such claims appeared to be allowable over the Barany patent. Applicant agreed to take under consideration the Examiner’s suggestions and submit an amendment.